

Remarks

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the review of the present application.

Examiner Interview Summary

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for his time in discussing the Continuity Data as it appears on PAIR and the Published Application (U.S. PG Pub. US 2007/0112530) of the present application. Applicants have noted that the Continuity Data, as it appears on PAIR and U.S. PG Pub. US 2007/0112530 is incorrect. PAIR and the Published Application mistakenly refer to related application number 60/518,782 as 60/518,728. The actual serial number as reflected in the initial filing of the related application in both the specification and Application Data Sheet is correctly stated as 60/518,782.

The Applicants respectfully requested that the Continuity Data be corrected to reflect the correct serial number. Applicants have reviewed the Examiner's "Interview Summary" mailed July 24, 2008, but wish to draw the Examiner's attention to PAIR and the above-referenced Published Application, as the erroneous Continuity Data currently still appears.

In the Claims

Claims 1-24 are currently pending in the application. As discussed in greater detail below, Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 17, 21, 22 and 23. Claims 5 and 11 have been cancelled. No new matter has been added.

Objections to the Specification

The Office objected to the specification based on informalities. In response, Applicants have amended paragraphs 13 and 16 pursuant to MPEP 714 to correct the informalities. In particular, Applicants have amended "them" in line 8 of paragraph 13 to read "the". Additionally, Applicants have amended the word "turpidity" in line 13 of paragraph 13 to read "turbidity", and "of" in line 11 of paragraph 16 to read "or", to correct typographical errors.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112

The Office rejected claim 7 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 7 to specify an output “flow rate” sensor.

Applicants respectfully submit this overcomes the stated rejection and request the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 USC 112.

Rejections under 35 USC §102

The Office action rejects claims 1-3, 6, 11-17, and 21-23 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,973,481 issued to Thompson et al (hereinafter referred to as “Thompson”). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 5 and 11 have been cancelled, thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of these claims has been made moot.

Thompson fails to teach all of the elements of claims 1, 21 and 23. Specifically, Thompson fails to disclose, amongst other elements, a water purification device. As such, claims 1, 21 and 23 are not anticipated by Thompson.

Further, as claims 1, 21 and 23 have been shown allowable over Thompson, claims 2-4, 6-10, 12-20 and 22 are allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim. For these reasons and others, some of which are discussed above, Applicant has shown that claims 1-4, 6-10, and 12-23 and 37 are allowable, and thus, requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 1-4, 6-10, and 12-23 and 37 over 35 USC §102(b).

Rejections under 35 USC §103

The Office action rejects claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, and 10 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,973,481 issued to Thompson et al. (“Thompson”) in view of U.S. PG Pub. 2003/0220717 issued to Underwood et al. (“Underwood”). Additionally, the Office action rejects claims 18-20 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,973,481 issued to Thompson et al. (“Thompson”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,568,416 issued to Tucker et al. (“Tucker”). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants have shown claim 1 to be allowable. Thus, claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 18-20 are allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim. For these reasons and others, some of which are discussed above, Applicants have shown that claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 18-20 are allowable, and thus, request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 18-20 over 35 USC §103(a).

Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in a form suitable for allowance. Therefore, the application is believed to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicants respectfully request early allowance of the application. The Applicants request that the Examiner contact the undersigned, Michelle Saquet Temple, if it will assist further examination of this application.

Applicants believe that a three-month extension of time is required. Applicants request that the required extension fees be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-4383. Applicants request that any other fee required for timely consideration of this application, be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-4383.

Date: September 25, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Michelle Saquet Temple /

Michelle Saquet Temple
Registration No. 48,834
Attorney for Applicants

DEKA Research & Development Corp.
340 Commercial Street
Manchester, NH 03101-1129
Tel: (603) 669-5139
Fax: (603) 624-0573